

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEAN MARC VAN DEN HEUVEL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
STARBUCKS COFFEE,  
Defendant.

No. 2:24-cv-00009 KJM AC PS

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was referred to the undersigned by E.D. Cal. R. 302(c)(21). Plaintiff has filed a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, and has submitted the affidavit required by that statute. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). The motion to proceed IFP will therefore be granted.

I. SCREENING

A determination that a plaintiff qualifies financially for in forma pauperis status does not complete the inquiry required by the statute. The federal IFP statute requires federal courts to dismiss a case if the action is legally “frivolous or malicious,” fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Plaintiff must assist the court in determining whether or not the complaint is frivolous, by drafting the complaint so that it complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the complaint

1 must contain (1) a “short and plain statement” of the basis for federal jurisdiction (that is, the  
2 reason the case is filed in this court, rather than in a state court), (2) a short and plain statement  
3 showing that plaintiff is entitled to relief (that is, who harmed the plaintiff, and in what way), and  
4 (3) a demand for the relief sought. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Plaintiff’s claims must be set forth  
5 simply, concisely and directly. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1).

6 A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.  
7 Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). In reviewing a complaint under this standard, the  
8 court will (1) accept as true all of the factual allegations contained in the complaint, unless they  
9 are clearly baseless or fanciful, (2) construe those allegations in the light most favorable to the  
10 plaintiff, and (3) resolve all doubts in the plaintiff’s favor. See Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327; Von  
11 Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena, 592 F.3d 954, 960 (9th Cir. 2010), cert.  
12 denied, 564 U.S. 1037 (2011).

13 The court applies the same rules of construction in determining whether the complaint  
14 states a claim on which relief can be granted. Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (court  
15 must accept the allegations as true); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974) (court must  
16 construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff). Pro se pleadings are held to a  
17 less stringent standard than those drafted by lawyers. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520  
18 (1972). However, the court need not accept as true conclusory allegations, unreasonable  
19 inferences, or unwarranted deductions of fact. Western Mining Council v. Watt, 643 F.2d 618,  
20 624 (9th Cir. 1981). A formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action does not suffice  
21 to state a claim. Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007); Ashcroft v. Iqbal,  
22 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). To state a claim on which relief may be granted, the plaintiff must  
23 allege enough facts “to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Twombly, 550 U.S. at  
24 570. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the  
25 court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”  
26 Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678.

27 A pro se litigant is entitled to notice of the deficiencies in the complaint and an  
28 opportunity to amend, unless the complaint’s deficiencies could not be cured by amendment. See

1 Noll v. Carlson, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448 (9th Cir. 1987), superseded on other grounds by statute as  
2 stated in Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir.2000)) (en banc).

## 3 II. THE COMPLAINT

4 The putative complaint is difficult to understand, consisting of disconnected stream-of-  
5 consciousness sentences. Under “statement of claim” for example, plaintiff writes “The  
6 20,000,000.00 ignorant to humanitarian considerations of actions absent full conceived measures  
7 of consideration for the ‘love of others’ and a true displacements of ‘powers’ by the estrogen  
8 powered offended woman manager was unthoughtful, selfish and injurious to the ongoing of  
9 stroke survivor Jean Marc Van den Huevel, born in the Belgian Congo, experienced the losses of  
10 both natural parents, endured life as an interracial victims of Los Angeles gangs, life of  
11 tribulations and learned how to become a ‘warrior’ over night due to the massive injustices of this  
12 pre-judgmental society by enduring these valuable life enduring consequential, by the employees  
13 of services at the United States Navy SEAL teams #3 and the endurings of #32 years of  
14 examples.” ECF No. 1 at 4.

## 15 III. ANALYSIS

16 The complaint does not contain facts supporting any cognizable legal claim against any  
17 defendant. The court finds that the complaint consists entirely of fanciful and delusional  
18 allegations with no basis on law and no plausible supporting facts. See ECF No. 1. The contents  
19 of the complaint are sufficiently unintelligible to make it clear that leave to amend in this case  
20 would not be fruitful. The undersigned will therefore recommend that the complaint be  
21 dismissed with prejudice.

## 22 IV. CONCLUSION

23 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s application to  
24 proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2), is GRANTED.


25 Further, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that all claims against all defendants should  
26 be DISMISSED with prejudice.

27 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
28 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days

1 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
2 with the court. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
3 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
4 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
5 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: January 26, 2024

8   
9 ALLISON CLAIRE  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28